



Warwick District Council

Core Strategy
Preferred Options

Report of Public Consultation

February 2010



1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to summarise the responses to the public consultation in relation to the Core Strategy Preferred Options held between July 3rd and September 25th 2009. The report also outlines the steps that were taken to publicise the consultation. The findings from this report, along with all the responses received will inform the next stages of the Core Strategy process.

Background

- 1.2 The Council are required to prepare a Core Strategy, which when adopted will update the planning policy framework for the District currently set out in the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011. The preparation process began in 2007 with the identification of the key issues that the Core Strategy will need to address. This included a series of meetings with local and national organisations, agencies and interest groups with an interest in Warwick District.
- 1.3 The Council used this information to prepare an Issues Paper which was the subject of public consultation during November 2007 to January 2008. This was accompanied by a questionnaire which the public were invited to complete. This consultation gave an opportunity for organisations, statutory bodies, businesses, and members of the public to be involved at an early stage of the production of the Core Strategy.
- 1.4 The consultation and responses to the Issues Paper led to the preparation by the Council of the Options for Growth Paper which was the subject of public consultation during May to July 2008. The findings from this consultation stage informed the Preferred Options which is the subject of this report. The report of public consultation for the Issues and Options stages of the process can be viewed on the Council website.

2. The Preferred Options Consultation

- 2.1 The purpose of the Preferred Options consultation was to seek the views of the public and organisations on how the Council proposes to deal with future growth and development in the District in strategic terms in the future, including how it proposes to meet the requirements for new housing and employment within the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy.
- 2.2 The consultation was supported by a Paper prepared by the Council which set out how it proposes to manage future growth and development. This was informed by evidence gathered from previous consultations and studies, the key social, economic and environmental characteristics of the District, a sustainability appraisal, as well as the relevant national and regional planning policies.
- 2.3 The Paper contained a Vision for the District in 2026, alongside a Strategy for where new development should be directed in order to achieve the Vision. A number of Strategic Objectives were also identified which represented the key issues. The

Council's Preferred Option for addressing each issue was set out under each objective.

Consultation Details

- 2.4 The consultation was held for a period of 12 weeks between July 3rd and September 25th 2009. The consultation was publicised through the following channels:
- Over 700 organisations, businesses, groups, and individuals who had previously expressed an interest in the Core Strategy process were informed directly either by email or letter;
 - An article was included in the Warwick District Focus Magazine which was distributed to every household in the District during July;
 - A letter and the same article as above was also distributed to around 3,000 households in residential areas adjoining the District's border within Coventry;
 - News items on the Council's website with links to a dedicated webpage on the Core Strategy;
 - Press release and advertisements in the local press;
 - Interviews on local radio stations;
 - Posters and information made available at all local libraries and Council offices;
 - A message for callers to the Council's Contact Centre who were kept on hold informing them of the consultation;
 - A briefing session for Town and Parish Councils and Resident Associations prior to the start of the consultation;
 - Presentations given by officers and Members at around 20 Community Forums and public meetings held across the District during the consultation; and
 - Attendance at meetings/forums with other stakeholders and partner organisations/groups.
- 2.5 The Preferred Options Paper was made available electronically on the Council's website and in paper form at the Council offices, the Town Hall, the Warwickshire Direct offices in Whitnash, Kenilworth and Lillington, and the Brunswick Healthy Living Centre. Paper copies were sent to all Town and Parish Councils and made available on request to all other organisations and members of the public. Copies were also made available at the public meetings attended by officers.
- 2.6 There were a number of different options available for people wishing to respond to the consultation. The Paper contained a questionnaire in order to enable respondents to structure their responses to the Council in relation to the various strategic objectives. This questionnaire was made available online on the Council's website to enable respondents to input their comments directly into the electronic consultation database. Alternatively, it was available electronically or in paper form for respondents to complete and submit to the Council. Responses could also be made in writing by letter or email.
- 2.7 Officers also kept a record of questions and issues raised at the public meetings and Community Forums they attended on behalf of the Council.

3. Summary of Responses

- 3.1 The Council received responses from 1,743 respondents, including members of the public, town and parish councils, statutory and non-statutory organisations, and landowners and developers. The majority of respondents (approximately 85%) have responded by letter, with a significant proportion using standardised letters objecting to the major areas of development identified to the south of Warwick/Leamington. The remainder have responded using the questionnaire on the website or via email.
- 3.2 All responses have been read, summarised and, where necessary, input by officers into the questionnaire within the electronic consultation database. All points raised have been recorded in the database and this has therefore required a degree of interpretation by officers as to which question within the Preferred Options Paper the comments relate to. A summary of all responses received forms part of the report of public consultation and can be viewed on the Council's website at:
- <http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/index.php>
- 3.3 In addition to the above responses, James Plaskitt MP for Warwick & Leamington and Jim Cunningham MP for Coventry South also submitted to the Council findings from their own household surveys in relation to development proposals within their respective constituencies. The Council also received four petitions which were signed in total by over 5,000 residents, as well as 25 individual letters received from pupils of St. Margaret's C.E. Junior School in Whitnash. The details of these submissions are set out in Appendix One.
- 3.4 The following brief analysis has been undertaken by officers to provide an overview of the response received by the Council. This analysis is structured around the questionnaire that was included in the Preferred Options Paper. The number of individual responses made to each specific question is recorded, along with the number of responses which agreed with the preferred option, the number that disagreed, and the number that just contained a more general comment. It should be noted that individual respondents may well have made more than one response to a question, and that a number of different points may have been recorded in any one response.
- 3.5 The analysis then highlights some of the main points raised by respondents, both those agreeing and disagreeing with the relevant preferred option. This analysis clearly does not attempt to cover all the points raised by respondents during the consultation and the exclusion of any particular point or issue does not imply it has any lesser importance. This analysis must therefore be read alongside the electronic consultation database on the Council's website referred to above.

3. Vision and Strategy

a. Do you agree with the Preferred Vision for Warwick District to 2026?

Total No. of Responses	904
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	87
Total No. of 'No' Responses	794
Total No. of Comments	23

Some of the comments made in relation to the Preferred Vision were:

- Vision to provide a mix of historic towns and villages set within a rural landscape of open farmland and parklands will not be achieved by the amount of new housing proposed;
- Vision is too long, unrealistic given the recession, unlikely to be achievable, and in places contradictory;
- Reference should be given to the different types of housing needed, e.g. homes for the elderly, affordable housing, or student accommodation;
- Greater reference should be given to the role of communities and families;
- Implications for transport and road congestion should be addressed in the vision; and
- Greater reference should be given to sustainability and the achievement of a low carbon community.

b. Do you agree with the Preferred Growth Strategy for Warwick District to 2026?

Total No. of Responses	727
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	69
Total No. of 'No' Responses	640
Total No. of Comments	18

Some of the comments made in relation to the Preferred Growth Strategy were:

- No evidence/solid argument for need for all the new houses and development. Development will result in urban sprawl, result in destruction of historic and natural heritage, loss of quality/standard of life, loss of wildlife corridors, increase in run-off and flooding, lack of infrastructure, additional traffic and increasing pollution. Need land for future food production;
- Brown field/regeneration sites should be developed instead of green field sites and green belt e.g. Airport, Ryton plant, Ford foundry, Stoneleigh centre;
- Development should be in a new town;
- Development along Leamington-Coventry rail corridor would encourage new station development and better services;
- Development should take place to south of Coventry. South of the District has seen all major growth in recent years. Developing to south of the District encourages car use and saturates area;
- Development should take place to south of District where access good to road network. Priority must be to develop south of Leamington/Warwick to preserve green belt;
- Development should take place throughout the District and not concentrated in one area;
- Agree that housing figures should be met; increasing population supports economic growth and wealth for the district; and,
- Agree with directing development at urban areas and limited development in villages to meet local need and support commitment to rural area with enabling development.

4. Strategic Objectives

a. Do you agree with the Strategic Objectives for Warwick District?

Total No. of Responses	164
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	75
Total No. of 'No' Responses	73
Total No. of Comments	16

Some of the comments made in relation to the Strategic Objectives were:

- Objectives are unrealistic, and the achievement of some of the objectives would conflict with the achievement of others;
- Reference should be given to the importance of education and learning, particularly in relation to the opportunities provided by cultural attractions;
- Objectives in relation to the natural and historic environment will not be achieved by allowing development on greenfield sites, particularly in the Green Belt;
- Specific reference should be given to meeting future housing and care needs, and that the housing needs of older people should be recognised;
- Reference needed to giving priority to the regeneration of deprived areas, and the re-use of unused employment land; and,
- Greater reference should be given to the importance of improving infrastructure, particularly transport.

5. Employment

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options for the location of new employment land?

Total No. of Responses	1,320
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	40
Total No. of 'No' Responses	1,259
Total No. of Comments	21

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for new employment land were:

- Question how the figures for manufacturing were devised particularly given the demise of large companies such as AP, Fords and Wolseley. There is no work for incomers or new residents and the current economy cannot support additional employment growth;
- Strategy does not make sufficient provision for employment across the district - reliance should not be placed on the existing forward supply of employment sites;
- Should have a clear plan on how they intend to attract new business;
- Supports the protection of existing employment sites and allocations and the redevelopment of vacant sites;
- There are already many empty industrial units on existing industrial parks such as Heathcote, Tachbrook Park and Warwick Technology Park – these vacant industrial premises should be used first before more are built;
- Disagrees with providing land to meet Coventry's employment needs;
- To reduce traffic problems and make better use of existing infrastructure employment should be allocated in Kenilworth and to the north of Leamington and Warwick; and,
- The Council has not considered opportunities in rural areas for employment.

b. Do you support or object to the following preferred locations for new employment land?

i) Land at Lower Heathcote Farm, south of Harbury Lane

Total No. of Responses	113
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	34
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	71
Total No. of Comments	8

Some of the comments made in relation to new employment land at this site were:

- Shortage of employment is in north of District not south;
- Too much employment land and vacant business premises in the area and no need to reclassify agricultural land. There is other brownfield and lesser quality sites available;
- Too near village;
- Traffic problems on Harbury Lane already;
- Spoil rural aspect/area of restraint and high quality landscape, and destruction of wildlife and eco-systems;
- Much of site is previously developed land, its use avoids the green belt and is of little agricultural value and not part of the wider landscape; and,
- Logical extension to business park opposite.

ii) Land west of Europa Way, Warwick

Total No. of Responses	107
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	50
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	51
Total No. of Comments	6

Some of the comments made in relation to new employment land at this site were:

- No demand for employment land as evidenced by empty units;
- Development would lead to loss of wildlife habitat, valuable arable land & Area of Restraint;
- Development would lead to increased traffic on already congested Europa Way;
- Evidence base not sufficiently robust to select preferable sites;
- There are better, less harmful alternatives e.g. Old Budbrooke Road;
- Location links well with two existing nearby employment areas; and,
- Location would minimise traffic through the town centres and is preferable to Green Belt location.

iii) Land at Thickthorn, Kenilworth

Total No. of Responses	122
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	55
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	58
Total No. of Comments	9

Some of the comments made in relation to new employment land at this site were:

- Protect the Green Belt – develop brownfield sites first. Existing business premises vacant – no new development needed;
- Loss of wildlife habitat, peace and open space, loss of residential amenity/ recreational space – area used for joggers, cyclists, walkers and horse riders;
- Existing road network in the area could not cope with additional development;
- Any expansion of Kenilworth would be detrimental to the character of the town, loss of civic pride;
- This area has the greatest capacity to meet employment needs. Provides opportunity for local employment for Kenilworth;
- Good location – close to West Midlands, proximity to A46, land is better used for employment than housing; and,
- Sustainability and deliverability key factors not the Green Belt.

iv) Land at Kings Hill, south of Green Lane, Finham

Total No. of Responses	137
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	49
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	80
Total No. of Comments	8

Some of the comments made in relation to new employment land at this site were:

- Green belt must be retained for future generations and to retain the gap between Coventry and Kenilworth. Alternative brown field sites which are more suitable such as the Peugeot site at Ryton and Coventry Airport;
- Insufficient infrastructure to cope with new development. Already at capacity and further development will impact on highway safety and result in additional traffic generation;
- Development will erode farmland needed for food production, impact on the environment and affect visual amenity and quality of life. Will result in the loss of wildlife habitats supporting badgers, newts and bats and an area of special landscape including ancient woodland;
- Development would be inappropriate due to the odour from the Finham Sewage Works and noise from the A46. Would risk the purity of water under the site from which Severn Trent extract the local water supply;
- Would allow development close to where jobs are needed in Coventry. Area has existing services such as schools and shops to accommodate new growth and there is the opportunity to provide additional infrastructure; and,
- Would reduce the pressure on services in Warwick and Leamington and reduce commuter traffic. Is close to Coventry and Warwick Universities and the proposed railway station at Kenilworth.

6. Town Centres

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	132
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	61
Total No. of 'No' Responses	51
Total No. of Comments	20

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for town centres were:

- Recognition of the different roles of each centre is welcomed and should be further exploited;
- Why develop new shops when there are so many vacant units available. Emphasis should be given to the re-use and development of existing under-utilised buildings;
- The Council should set up Development Agencies to regenerate the Old Town and canal side areas for mixed developments;
- Housing should feature in town centre developments to create sustainable centres;
- Out of centre developments should be limited as they are drawing town centre customers away; and,
- The Council should not focus so heavily on its town centres – local centres such as at Warwick Gates and Chase Meadow should be strengthened to build better communities.

b. Do you agree with the preferred hierarchy and strategy for each of the District's town and local centres?

Total No. of Responses	117
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	58
Total No. of 'No' Responses	49
Total No. of Comments	10

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for the town centres were:

- Town centres do not require expansion, they just require improvements. Emphasis should be on filling empty shops;
- Future allocations should maximise existing empty retail premises. Parking charges should be removed;
- Care should be taken to protect the heritage and character of our town centres;
- The Chandos Street development is questioned as is the emphasis for retailing in Leamington;
- Supportive, however a train station will be important for the future of Kenilworth; and,
- Supports the value placed on Warwick's local distinctiveness.

7. Tourism

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	104
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	59
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	37
Total No. of Comments	8

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for tourism were:

- Tourism is fundamental, it is not just about development but should include proactive marketing and promotion – historic towns are a major draw and there is a lack of distinctive town centre accommodation. Should be a policy to prevent loss of town centre accommodation unless shown to be no longer viable or not of adequate quality;
- Better links between Kenilworth Castle and town centre and greater cohesive efforts with organisations such as Shakespeare Company to help optimise this as a way to generate more business for the town;
- Suggestion that lack of overnight accommodation limits overnight stays is pure speculation. Central location and good transport links makes area easily accessible as day trip destination. 75% figure of visitors not staying overnight has not been broken down to differentiate between types of visitors, e.g. coach tours, days out and organised trips;
- More emphasis on the retention, enhancement and expansion of existing tourist attractions;
- Object to inclusion of cultural facilities within this topic as it excludes cultural facilities from other strategic areas of Core Strategy. Cultural facilities include libraries, art galleries, cinemas and theatres which are utilised by residents; and,
- Neglects the potential of the Green belt for tourism.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option, particularly in respect of visitor accommodation?

Total No. of Responses	97
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	64
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	26
Total No. of Comments	7

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for tourism were:

- Sensible approach, providing existing facilities fully utilised before new development built;
- Supportive of preferred option, which identifies importance to economy of District. Could be strengthened through reference to other key elements which contribute to creating visitor destination, such as townscape/public realm in contributing to a sense of place, transport, infrastructure and provision of retail, entertainment, food and drink outlets;
- Links to wider South Warwickshire tourism offer, could add value and increase visitor stays by making links and encouraging tourists; and,
- Recommendations are too limited; do not encompass new tourism trends and should encourage new enterprises.

8. Regeneration

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	115
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	58
Total No. of 'No' Responses	46
Total No. of Comments	11

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for regeneration were:

- Possibilities for regeneration in the towns – bring forward brownfield sites;
- Deprived areas should be given priority; and,
- Vacant sites could be brought forward for growing food/ allotments.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	106
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	54
Total No. of 'No' Responses	42
Total No. of Comments	10

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for regeneration were:

- Regeneration should be carried out in a professional & sustainable way;
- Regeneration projects should help deprived communities;
- Local people should be involved in regeneration projects;
- Regeneration should be linked to low carbon technology & services;
- Regeneration should be linked to housing & employment; and,
- Specific areas mentioned e.g. Station Area, Old Town and South Sydenham.

9. Rural Communities

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	126
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	60
Total No. of 'No' Responses	56
Total No. of Comments	10

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for rural communities were:

- No support for market housing in villages as this leads to higher income families commuting to other towns by car and not supporting village life. Should include local housing need evidence in Core Strategy and only allow 100% affordable housing provision;
- Rural communities should decide what is best for them. Villages should be allowed to develop their own way subject to local consultation and not have new housing and employment units bolted on encroaching on countryside;
- Leave rural communities as they are, there is no need for strengthening;
- More employment needs to be allocated to rural area including hi-tech/light manufacturing, care villages and strategy should be more prescriptive;
- Emphasis should be placed on support – transport, retail and service needs to underpin existing communities. Employment needed in villages and positive policies required for rural building re-use; and,
- Need to encourage mix of housing.

b. Do you support or object to the Preferred Option, particularly in respect of rural housing?

Total No. of Responses	109
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	50
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	49
Total No. of Comments	10

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for rural communities were:

- 'Bottom up' approach is entirely correct. Unused land in all villages and owners should be encouraged to offer it for development. Flesh out option with minimum 80 new homes in each village settlement up to 2026 small scale and in several locations;
- Inappropriate to set limitations on scale of development that may be permitted as this approach is negative. Seek to implement positive, practical policies that encourage affordable housing that is proportional in scale and nature to need and character of rural area
- Rural housing policy should be flexible and enable schemes within and on the edge of rural settlements. Doing nothing results in loss of more village communities and then they may as well be merged into towns. Some village growth necessary to maintain schools, shops, other infrastructure;
- Allocating new housing or employment to specific sites around villages is unlikely to achieve the objective of strengthening rural communities;
- Should be a sensitive approach to villages to preserve their beauty. Small villages should not be turned into mini towns. Villages should remain small with village envelopes to control development;
- Extra housing would lead to more traffic and congestion. Object to market housing, but support affordable to meet local need of those already living in parish;
- Risk of overprovision of housing with no firm policy to manage rural land supply; and,
- Balance requirements of affordable housing for local residents with desires of developers who prefer to build for 'executives'.

10. Housing

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options for the location of new housing?

Total No. of Responses	2129¹
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	40
Total No. of 'No' Responses	2024
Total No. of Comments	65

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for housing were:

- Growth should be dispersed across the District including in villages;
- Convert empty dwellings and unused office blocks;
- More student accommodation on campus and retirement villages would release family homes;
- More work required on identifying brownfield sites;

¹ As explained in paragraph 3.4, respondents may have submitted or have been assigned more than one response to this question and this explains why there are more responses than the total number of respondents.

- Suggestions for alternative sites e.g. Coventry Airport, Ford’s Foundry, Hatton Park, Stoneleigh Park, north Warwick & Leamington, edge of Coventry, north & south Kenilworth, New Town;
- More realistic allowance / no allowance for windfalls should be made; and,
- Locations preferable to Green Belt sites.

10b. Do you support or object to the following preferred locations of new housing?

(i). Land at Former Ford Foundry, Leamington

Total No. of Responses	119
Total No. of ‘Support’ Responses	94
Total No. of ‘Object’ Responses	14
Total No. of Comments	11

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Strong support for the re-use of this brownfield site, and suggest the density of development be increased to accommodate more dwellings;
- Concerns raised regarding the impact on infrastructure, particularly the capacity of the road network;
- Concern as to the lack of developer interest in the site and the impact this may have on timing of development;
- Objections made primarily on the grounds of the need to protect the site for employment uses, and concern at the impact of contamination on residential uses; and,
- Query as to whether the site was strategic and warranted to be allocated for development.

(ii). Land at Station Approach, Leamington

Total No. of Responses	112
Total No. of ‘Support’ Responses	89
Total No. of ‘Object’ Responses	16
Total No. of Comments	7

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Strong support for the re-use of this brownfield site, and suggest the density of development be increased to accommodate more dwellings;
- Concerns raised regarding the impact on infrastructure, particularly the capacity of the road network;
- Concern as to the lack of developer interest in the site and the impact this may have on timing of development; and,
- Suggestion that a mixed use development might be more appropriate, particularly including uses related to the train station.

(iii). Land at Warwickshire College, Leamington

Total No. of Responses	84
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	63
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	18
Total No. of Comments	3

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Strong support for the re-use of this brownfield site;
- Concerns raised regarding the impact on infrastructure, particularly the capacity of the road network; and,
- Some objections on the grounds of the need to retain the site for future college expansion or student accommodation.

(iv) Land South of Sydenham and East of Whitnash

Total No. of Responses	1,144
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	53
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	1,083
Total No. of Comments	8

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Other brownfield sites are a better option. Coventry Airport and the land adjacent to Warwick Parkway are considered to be better alternatives;
- Area is prime farmland and therefore must not be developed;
- Provision of access to this area will not be easy to achieve;
- Development would overload existing infrastructure, schools , roads, sewers, etc;
- Development would damage the historical Brook Valley area; and,
- Contrary to current Area of Restraint policy; and,
- Development is supported at this location as it is considered a better option than the release of Green Belt land.

(v) Land at Woodside Farm, Whitnash

Total No. of Responses	1,147
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	36
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	1,106
Total No. of Comments	5

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Brownfield sites within Leamington and Coventry Airport should be used as an alternative. Areas to the north of the district should be developed instead – preferably Finham, Baginton, Kenilworth, Cubbington, Lillington, Milverton, North Warwick and West Warwick;
- Infrastructure cannot cope with this proposal (not enough school places in the Whitnash locality);
- Development of such a large swathe of open countryside is contrary to the Councils environmental policy. Destruction of the Tachbrook Valley would cause an unacceptable loss of the rural landscape and lead to a loss of local distinctiveness. Much valuable flora and fauna would be lost if this land is developed;

- Woodside Farm was discounted at the last Local Plan Inquiry – why is it considered appropriate now;
- Development would lead to the loss of valuable agricultural land;
- Supported as an alternative to Green Belt releases; and,
- Land at Woodside Farm could link the playing fields to the existing Warwick Gates development.

(vi) Land at Lower Heathcote Farm, south of Harbury Lane

Total No. of Responses	1,215
Total No. of ‘Support’ Responses	34
Total No. of ‘Object’ Responses	1,171
Total No. of Comments	10

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Lack of infrastructure – schools, roads, medical facilities, shops, sewers. Lack of road network to cope resulting in pollution (air quality and noise). Increase in flood risk for new and existing properties;
- Loss of countryside, landscape quality, wildlife habitats, rural landscape and quality agricultural land;
- Destruction of Bishops Tachbrook as village and loss of character. Development would be highly visible. Coalescence of Bishops Tachbrook, Whitnash and Warwick Gates to form suburb of Leamington;
- Lack of employment and opportunities;
- Not the ‘preferred option’ of public through previous consultation;
- Concern for present park homes site and residents;
- Housing focussed in area best able to accommodate new development without encroaching on green belt; and,
- Connected to local employment. Complements preferred employment location as best placed for commuters.

(vii) Land at Europa Way, Warwick

Total No. of Responses	756
Total No. of ‘Support’ Responses	50
Total No. of ‘Object’ Responses	700
Total No. of Comments	6

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Loss of green wedge between Warwick & Leamington and separate identity of the two towns;
- Inadequate infrastructure to serve development - schools & GPs oversubscribed; roads overloaded; trains full; impact on sewerage, drainage and water supply;
- Environmental impact – loss of habitat & arable land; increased pollution;
- Area of Restraint so should be developed in later phase;
- Area has experienced too much growth already; and,
- Site well located for access to services, town centres and employment areas.

(viii) Land at Thickthorn, Kenilworth

Total No. of Responses	180
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	63
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	104
Total No. of Comments	13

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Intensification of traffic on local roads, Thickthorn island and A452, resulting in queuing and congestion. Speeding also an issue making roads dangerous. Insufficient space to widen/build roads;
- Loss of green belt/green field/high value agricultural land and concern about effect on woodland, conservation area, water, flooding and drainage issues, particularly the effect on Ashow;
- Infrastructure issues, particularly schools, police and health services. Fire station closing;
- Impact on visual approach to the town. Will have greater impact on existing residents than other proposed areas;
- Recreation areas should be preserved for community welfare;
- Support provided suitable site found for rugby club;
- Support subject to sympathetic plans retaining habitats for wildlife and mature trees/woodland; and,
- Good location; natural and suitable infill site next to A46 so no great incursion into open countryside and not agricultural land. Ideal if developed in parallel with new railway station.

(ix) Land at Kings Hill, south of Green Lane, Finham

Total No. of Responses	303
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	53
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	235
Total No. of Comments	15

Some of the comments made in relation to new housing on this site were:

- Green belt should be retained for future generations. Other redundant brownfield sites in Coventry as well as Baginton Airport and the Peugeot Ryton site which could be used for new development;
- Insufficient infrastructure to cope with new development. It is already at capacity and further development will impact on highway safety and result in additional traffic generation;
- Development will erode farmland needed for food production, impact on the environment and affect visual amenity and quality of life. Will result in the loss of wildlife habitats supporting badgers, newts and bats;
- Development would be inappropriate due to the odour from the Finham Sewage Works and noise from the A46. Would risk the purity of water under the site from which Severn Trent extract the local water supply;
- Area is close to the West Midlands where jobs are needed whereas unemployment is lower in Warwick and Leamington; and,
- Close to existing infrastructure in Kenilworth and Coventry and there is the opportunity to build further infrastructure to accommodate the new development. It is equal distance to Warwick and Coventry Universities and would be close to the proposed Kenilworth railway station.

c. Do you support or object to the preferred option for securing a mix of new housing?

Total No. of Responses	141
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	74
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	51
Total No. of Comments	16

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for securing a mix of new housing were:

- Should be applied flexibly on a site by site basis; needs change over time;
- Need for bungalows / housing for older people;
- Danger of social engineering – too much affordable housing leads to social problems;
- Minimum size standards should be enforced as part of Residential Design Guide;
- Same house types should be located together/should not mix private and affordable housing; and,
- Housing mix is a function of the market place.

d. Do you support or object to the preferred option for securing affordable homes?

Total No. of Responses	154
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	51
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	83
Total No. of Comments	20

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for securing affordable homes were:

- Policy should be supported by evidence and a viability study ; targets should be set and monitored;
- Policy would devalue area and lead to crime & social disorder;
- Increase to 50% will dissuade developers from developing sites;
- Threshold should be the same for urban & rural areas/ threshold should be lowered;
- Percentage should be lowered to 30%/20%;
- Affordable housing should be dispersed including within villages; and,
- Each scheme should be individually assessed for affordable housing requirement.

e. Do you support or object to the preferred option for the density of new housing?

Total No. of Responses	128
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	53
Total No. of 'No' Responses	65
Total No. of Comments	10

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for density were:

- Need higher proportion of sites as open space;
- Maximum of two/three storeys;
- Emphasis should be on high quality design;
- Should be a range of densities/flexibility to reflect local site circumstances;
- Densities should be increased, especially in town centres; and,
- Densities of 40/50dph are appropriate.

f. Do you support or object to levels of housing growth higher than those proposed by the Preferred Option?

Total No. of Responses	233
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	5
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	207
Total No. of Comments	21

Some of the comments made in relation to higher levels of growth were:

- Would lead to towns and villages conjoining;
- Would lead to loss of Green Belt;
- The level in the RSS Preferred Option is already too high;
- Character of towns & villages will be damaged;
- Lack of infrastructure to support more growth; and.
- House builders would be unable to deliver higher levels.

11. Infrastructure

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	1,596
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	38
Total No. of 'No' Responses	1,525
Total No. of Comments	33

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for rural communities were:

- Need for comprehensive 'Community Infrastructure' 'with preservation of open spaces within or adjacent to urban development;
- Need for ongoing process to identify necessary infrastructure improvements in line with actual site developments;
- Seek every opportunity to secure new infrastructure capital funding, e.g. CIL and S106;
- No infrastructure details provided. IDP needed with the Preferred Options document;
- Existing infrastructure and services are overstretched, e.g. schools, hospitals, police, doctors, public transport/ trains, roads, water supply, surface water drainage, sewage and waste disposal, parking, local shops and employment, local community/sports facilities/ children's' playgrounds, cycle routes;
- Access to M40 already very congested with long traffic jams at peak times. An additional 8000 cars will make it worse. Major routes from Bishops Tachbrook/Whitnash/ Warwick Gates to Leamington and Warwick and motorway are heavily congested in south of town – impact on residents and tourism detrimentally;
- Concern that money for proposed infrastructure should be traceable and accountable and used for the proposed growth; and,
- More health and sport facilities needed for young people and elderly.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	112
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	40
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	60
Total No. of Comments	12

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for infrastructure were:

- Developers must contribute to green infrastructure/allotments at the start of development- as a condition;
- Sensible option and allows for adaptation in changing circumstances;
- Need for ongoing process of identification of infrastructure improvements;
- Providing it adequately supports reflects needs of the sites and economic viability;
- Not enough existing infrastructure to support growth; and,
- Some broad infrastructure requirements for the development of the strategic sites could be included.

c. Do you think the Council should adopt the Community Infrastructure Levy approach to securing developer contributions?

Total No. of Responses	119
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	59
Total No. of 'No' Responses	41
Total No. of Comments	19

Some of the comments made in relation to the adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy were:

- Support as the burden should be shared;
- Developers should contribute towards roads, schools , health facilities and better access to local facilities and public transport in order to sustain growth - the one stop shop is a good approach;
- Concept is supported however monitoring should be undertaken to ensure it is used for its intended purpose;
- Levy should be decided on a site by site basis depending on the infrastructure needs;
- May encourage brown field development first;
- Would be a fair, consistent and transparent way of securing funds compared with Section 106 contributions;
- Will make new houses even more expensive – the government and local authorities should improve infrastructure so the burden is shared. Cannot expect developers to pay out of their profits as they are businesses; and,
- Adds another layer of complexity and could discourage development in areas where it is really needed (i.e. regeneration).

12. Open Space

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	125
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	47
Total No. of 'No' Responses	64
Total No. of Comments	14

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for open space were:

- Does not set out clearly what new green space offer will be forthcoming in conjunction with new development;
- Open space should be further enhanced/increased in line with future housing developments;
- Open space needs to be better defined and protected;
- Principles are well founded but should be informed by a PPG17 compliant assessment; and,
- A vision for the long term use of Castle Park should be developed. A new linear park linking south of Harbury Lane housing development with Castle Park could be important.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	101
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	47
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	48
Total No. of Comments	6

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for open space were:

- Housing requirements of the Core Strategy directly conflict with the defence of open spaces;
- Core Strategy should also have within it the objective of protecting open spaces of historical interest – declaring further conservation areas to assist this aim may be beneficial;
- Green spaces should be identified at the start of any future development programmes/ not as an afterthought; and,
- Should be a stipulation on the minimum open space required on each allocation as a percentage of the overall development area.

13. Community Safety

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	104
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	47
Total No. of 'No' Responses	51
Total No. of Comments	6

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for community safety were:

- The Council need to tackle the causes of crime and provide communities with additional police and security resources;
- Potential crime areas should be prioritised to ensure prevention of problems before they develop;
- Would support SPD on planning and crime;

- Large estates lack social cohesion which leads to antisocial behaviour – housing should be developed on a small scale within existing communities;
- More work could be done to understand why people commit crime, and to promote community spirit; and,
- Commitment of the police is vital to achieving these objectives.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	81
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	44
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	33
Total No. of Comments	4

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for community safety were:

- The Council should have its own guidelines which should strongly influence planning decisions;
- Potential crime areas should be considered at start of development. Prevention is better than cure;
- Housing estates generate anti-social behaviour in young people with fewer police patrolling officers;
- Some things can be done in design of the environment to reduce crime, but whatever is done, crime will occur in a different way until citizens learn to respect each other;
- Reducing crime and anti-social behaviour by high quality design is impossible dream; and,
- Incorporate community strategy in consultation with police and build housing with security in mind.

14. Inclusive Access

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	101
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	58
Total No. of 'No' Responses	39
Total No. of Comments	4

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for inclusive access were:

- Options seem well thought out. All should have access to health services and shopping centres through comprehensive public transport system;
- Delighted to see long term vision of comprehensive public transport strategy. Putting pedestrian and cycle journeys at top of the agenda is crucial to lowering carbon emissions;
- More roads and more traffic from new housing will aggravate existing roads which are already choked; and,
- Agree SPG suitable vehicle for design aspects.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	84
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	51
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	25
Total No. of Comments	8

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for inclusive access were:

- Future development will exacerbate issues of access and mobility. Must be clarity that infrastructure improvements can be funded and in tandem with housing/employment
- Should not try to social engineer communities;
- Strategic developments should include consideration of all these issues and make provision for them to comply with guidelines;
- Future plans must encompass more allotments with accessibility and facilities for mixed groups and schools to enjoy the healthy outdoors;
- Canal corridors provide socially indiscriminate access for walking and cycling; and,
- Support provision of local centres and opportunities for local shops and businesses.

15. Gypsies and Travellers

a. Do you support or object to the preferred criteria for selecting the location of gypsy and traveller sites?

Total No. of Responses	97
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	47
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	47
Total No. of Comments	3

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred criteria for gypsy and traveller sites were:

- New sites should not be built on green field sites. Utilities should be provided but no new sites should be allowed near low lying flood risk areas or areas of natural beauty;
- Should include reference to previously developed land;
- Sites should not impact on residents who are non-traveller;
- Should indicate how pitches will be delivered; and,
- Consider locations in or near existing settlements. Towns more able to meet facilities required;
- Should be limited to small sites of 10-12 vehicles to ensure minimal impact;
- Controlled site is essential; and,
- Support avoidance of impact on historic environment.

16. Historic Environment

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	138
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	67
Total No. of 'No' Responses	48
Total No. of Comments	23

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for the historic environment were:

- Supports approach however a compromise should be found where article four directions are applied sensitively;
- Support the preparation of an SPD providing detailed advice;
- Firm stance should be taken when protecting historic buildings. Poor quality development has already had an impact on the character of our historic towns;
- Policy only appears to cover historic sites in towns but should also protect historical fields;
- Protecting the historic environment should not be led by commercial gain – financial support should be given by other means;
- Landscape policies for protecting historic buildings should be retained and the preferred options are too weak;
- Existing Conservation areas should be referenced in the Core Strategy; and,
- Should be a balance between conserving historic buildings and having regard to 21st century issues such as climate change.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	83
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	59
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	24
Total No. of Comments	0

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for the historic environment were:

- Balanced approach is needed – requirements to enhance the environment should not stifle economic development;
- Supports greater use of article four directions, more direct use of enforcement powers to restore and enhance historic buildings and use of local lists;
- Conservation areas need to be reviewed and enlarged – more parkland and open space should be included. Supports the protection and maintenance of historic gardens both as a historical record but also as a living example of gardens; and,
- Encourage landowners to maintain the historic environment.

17. Natural Environment

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	1,398
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	45
Total No. of 'No' Responses	1,323
Total No. of Comments	30

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for the natural environment were:

- Core Strategy is putting housing requirements above the need to preserve the natural environment;
- Should recognise the importance of urban gardens to wildlife and the role that biodiversity plays in helping urban areas adapt to climate change;
- Role of sport in the natural environment should be considered;
- Buffer between Warwick Gates and Bishops Tachbrook should not be developed;
- Europa Way site is rich in habitat/wildlife and should be maintained as an Area of Restraint; and,
- Area of Restraint and Green Belt areas should remain unscathed by development.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option, particularly in respect of amendments to the Area of Restraint?

Total No. of Responses	108
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	36
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	67
Total No. of Comments	5

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for the natural environment were:

- No point in the Areas of Restraint if the Council can change them when they feel like it;
- Area of Restraint should be identified to include the Green Belt Land around Coventry;
- Area of Restraint at Europa Way and South of Sydenham should be left alone;
- Intended Area of Restraint between Bishop's Tachbrook and Whitnash will not be of an adequate distance to form a meaningful separation;
- Areas of Restraint are worthless as the Core Strategy is seeking to radically reduce them;
- Area of Restraint at Woodside Farm should be maintained;
- Land West of Europa Way should be deleted from the Area of Restraint as it does not meet many of the purposes for such a designation; and,
- Area of Restraint between Leamington Spa and Radford Semele is overly expansive.

18. Built Environment

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	122
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	49
Total No. of 'No' Responses	65
Total No. of Comments	8

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for the built environment were:

- How does need to protect historic environment and existing townscapes and landscapes square with the need for better buildings. Environmental efficiency versus building character. Protecting 'amenity' of existing residents should be more important than new build levels;
- Good design means different things to different people – nebulous comment;
- Quality buildings and environments will not arise from controlling standards imposed on designers. Design requires imagination to solve problems and good design difficult to define;
- Imperative that all new buildings have optimum levels of insulation and low carbon emissions. Important that new developments must be high quality and sympathetic to the area;
- Adequate importance should be placed on green space, gardens and allotments in new developments. Integration of natural environment into new development;
- Villages should retain unique character, identity and individuality;
- Needs to address poor quality of suburban design; and,
- Future development should respect domestic architecture in classical towns.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	87
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	45
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	38
Total No. of Comments	4

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for the built environment were:

- Recent developments have been low quality and need to be avoided in future. Design by committee seldom works;
- Incorporate CABE and English Heritage guidelines;
- Design of houses should be overseen by Council and not left to developers. Council has Design Guides – these need to be used when deciding planning applications;
- No indication given of the form any framework would take and this needs to be established ahead of any development;
- Buildings should have some originality. New sites give opportunity for modern buildings and good design; and,
- Good design is subjective but should consider non-vernacular put forward by architects and designers.

19. Sustainable Buildings

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	91
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	52
Total No. of 'No' Responses	31
Total No. of Comments	8

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for sustainable buildings were:

- Policy could go further in addressing the issue of carbon offsets;
- Should do more to ensure all new homes will meet strict sustainability criteria;
- National standards for zero carbon should be brought forward to 2012 and apply to all buildings;
- Technologies are expensive compared with their payback time and the savings which are achieved;
- More consideration is needed of older properties where it may be difficult to meet energy efficiency levels. Incentives such as grants and lower rate levels could be used.
- Should consider opportunities for retro fitting and energy efficiency overall rather than confining the options to new development; and,
- Should consider the expertise of British Waterways in the use of micro hydro power generation on canal locks and weirs, water based heat technology and the use of water for drought and flood management.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option, particularly in respect of higher targets for the reduction of carbon emissions?

Total No. of Responses	85
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	52
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	29
Total No. of Comments	4

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for sustainable buildings were:

- Agreement that the Council has taken a sensible approach;
- Standards should be much higher and more stringent with the aim that buildings should be as carbon neutral as possible;
- Higher targets should not be pursued at extra cost as there are other more important priorities;
- Council should not exceed targets set out in the RSS;
- To be sustainable the lifespan of new buildings needs to be increased;
- More traffic generated through new development will increase carbon emissions. Targets will not be reached unless vehicles become carbon neutral;
- Council should facilitate larger renewable initiatives as smaller domestic systems are unlikely to produce significant amounts of energy;
- Should recognise the difficulty of implementing renewables and energy efficiency measures in the historic environment; and,
- Should consider opportunities for retro fitting.

20. Flood Risk

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	280
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	46
Total No. of 'No' Responses	223
Total No. of Comments	11

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for flood risk were:

- The Council's approach is in accordance with PPS25;
- New development should acknowledge potential flood risk as a consequence of climate change. In the future climate change is likely to increase the frequency of heavy rainfall events therefore buffer zones around existing water courses should be preserved;
- Concern that further development on green field land will increase existing flood issues and the risk of flooding at Warwick Gates, Land at Kings Hill, Finham, Thickthorn, Myton Road and Whitnash;
- The Council should ban the use of non permeable paving and develop targets for the use of green roofs, SUDs and rain harvesting systems to manage surface water drainage; and,
- Water supply requirements have not been adequately assessed, and water pressure is already very low in some areas.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	85
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	50
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	32
Total No. of Comments	3

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for flood risk were:

- Support actions to minimise the risk of flooding;
- Agrees with approach but needs further thought on implementation;
- Should be recognised that the incidence of flooding has increased as more development has taken place in the district. Further development will increase existing flood problems;
- The Council should not allow development on areas at risk of flooding; and,
- Should include measures to address surface water management.

21. Waste and Recycling

a. Do you agree that the Council has identified all reasonable options?

Total No. of Responses	101
Total No. of 'Yes' Responses	62
Total No. of 'No' Responses	35
Total No. of Comments	4

Some of the comments made in relation to the options for waste and recycling were:

- New houses will not be adequately provided for – additional waste will cause potential health hazards;
- New housing and major developments should require on site composting;
- Recycling should be continued and expanded – Councils should aim for 100% recycling and not be controlled by market forces;
- Recycling waste bins are needed in town centre locations to segregate waste;
- May be potential to transport waste via the canal network and quarry material from Rugby to Leamington for development; and,
- Object that the Council continues to view incineration as the only option.

b. Do you support or object to the preferred option?

Total No. of Responses	87
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	61
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	24
Total No. of Comments	2

Some of the comments made in relation to the preferred option for waste and recycling were:

- All homes should be encouraged to recycle as much as possible and to compost waste;
- Anything that helps the environment is great – waste should be minimised at the source;
- Policy should ensure sustainable waste management during the construction of every development;
- Larger building plots are needed to allow for bin storage;
- Strategy should address the increased need for vermin control as a result of animals feeding on the stored waste; and,
- Based on current levels of recycling the targets are not challenging.

Appendix One: Other Responses

MP Surveys: Both James Plaskitt MP for Warwick & Leamington and Jim Cunningham MP for Coventry South have undertaken their own household surveys in relation to proposals within their respective areas.

James Plaskitt MP undertook a household survey of residents in Warwick Gates, Bishops Tachbrook and parts of Whitnash. To date, 1,050 constituents have replied. 50% agreed that further housing is needed, with 50% disagreeing. On the proposal to place up to 4,000 homes south of Harbury Lane, 85% disagreed that any development should be considered. Of the remaining 15%, most felt 1,500 homes should be the limit. 93% felt the current total was too high. The infrastructure needs identified were a new school, improved bus links, medical services, a post office and more shops. He concludes that housing development in this area on this scale does not carry public support and urges the Council to reconsider its approach.

Jim Cunningham MP received 39 responses directly from his constituents. They object to housing at Kings Hill, Finham on the grounds of traffic impact and inadequate roads, insufficient housing and employment need, loss of green belt, impact on schools, loss of wildlife, lack of drainage, noise impact, landscape impact, loss of farmland, They suggest alternative sites should be used in Coventry, at the Former Peugeot site in Ryton, Baginton Airport and at Warwick Parkway. Others argue the housing is needed and would support local shops.

Petitions

Petition One: Bishops Tachbrook Parish Council (signed by 657 residents of Bishops Tachbrook) object to the building of 4,200 houses south of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash.

Petition Two: Finham Residents Association (signed by 3,766 residents) object to build houses on Kings Hill as such a proposal would destroy the Green Belt between Coventry and Kenilworth. The infrastructure in Finham is already overburdened and would be unable to sustain any further development.

Petition Three: Save Green Spaces (signed by 121 residents) object to the building of over 4,000 houses between Warwick Gates and Bishops Tachbrook.

Petition Four: Warwick Town Council (signed by 839 residents) and Whitnash Town Council (signed by 254 residents) object to massive greenfield housing developments and call upon Councillors to:

- Support additional time for a full and proper appraisal of housing and employment land requirements to 2026;
- Question the projected population growth of 40,000 before determining how many new houses are required;
- Investigate and determine the infrastructure for all the development options, water and sewage, transport, education, health, roads, shopping, community activities and green space, and the impact on existing communities;
- Provide evidence to support the assertion that people will work, shop, go to school, and spend leisure time close to new homes in the south of the District, and to address the problems that would be created by traffic which would actually be created;
- Retain green space which distinguishes and separates the towns of Kenilworth, Leamington, Warwick, Whitnash and other areas of the District;

- Avoid serious detrimental impact of the environment, which would arise from locating the bulk of housing in close proximity to existing development, creating continuous urban sprawl;
- Allocate development required to meet local needs across the whole District, and to avoid a disproportionate impact on particular residents and communities; and
- To reassess the Preferred Options to reflect the above.

In addition, 25 letters were received from pupils of St. Margaret's C.E. Junior School, Coppice Road, Whitnash. They object to the building of 4,200 homes and raise concerns in relation to increased traffic and its environmental effects, loss of farmland and the impact on food supplies, loss of wildlife, demand on school places and the cost to the Council of providing more schools, and the need for supporting shops, nurseries and health facilities. They suggest an alternative strategy of putting houses in smaller groups around the County and throughout the villages, and using old factories/offices, brownfield sites and land that is not farmed.